

**DCAM-13-CS-0153
BROAD BRANCH STREAM RESTORATION
AND CULVERT DAYLIGHTING PROJECT**

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI)

RESPONSE TO OFFEROR RFI'S:

Q-1 The RFP calls for a three year warranty on the project and is not limited to improper construction. This will raise the cost of the bids considerably. Will you consider a more limited warranty for cost savings?

Response:

A-1. The warranty should be a line item in the proposed lump sum bid. The warranty should cover defects in construction that appear as a part of the design storm event. Impacts to stream structures outside of the design storm event are not required to be covered as a part of the warranty.

Q-2 The RFP is a lump sum bid but also calls for measurement of units. What is the measurement of units for?

Response:

A-2. This was an error in the RFP documents. Mention of measurement of units has been removed from the amended version.

Q-3 The designs call for the use of sandstone boulders. Some contractors have found that the cost of sandstone boulders has risen considerably. Is there a possibility that another material may be substituted?

Response:

A-3. Yes, these can be boulders that have a natural appearance and are equivalent in size to Class 3 Rip Rap (average diameter = 25.4 inches). They should be from a local stone producer and be approved before use.

Q-4 The plan set still shows a manhole crossing Linnean Ave. as could not be opened. Is this still accurate?

Response:

A-4. No. This is not accurate. The manhole was opened and it was verified that the sewer line in the street does not continue across the culvert crossing. This will be corrected in the design set for construction.

Q-5 Can we get a list of changes made to the plans from 95% to 100%?

Response:

- A-5. S
- a. Revisions to inlets and pipe size and changes to profile and grading for Stormwater Recharge Facilities 1, 2 and 3.
 - b. Revised planting plan, particularly trees
 - c. Revised grading, alignment and outlet structure on Tributary D. Details of outlet DS-1 added.
 - d. Details of flow splitting manhole added
 - e. Some changes to Linnaean Ave MOT plans
 - f. Erosion and Sediment Control Plan changes for Trib. D
 - g. Revised Sequence of Construction
 - h. SRF 1 has been enlarged
 - i. Level spreader detail added for bottom of Trib. c

Q-6 Is there an updated cost estimate for 100% designs?

Response:

A-6. Although we will have a new cost estimate for the 100% designs, we will not be sharing the new cost estimate.

Q-7 Whose responsibility is it to move the gas line that crosses the project area? The water main?

Response:

A-7. We are in communication with Washington Gas about moving the line. We have not yet received an answer on whether Washington Gas will move it or whether they will ask the contractor to do it as a part of the project. The contractor should include this item as a line item in the lump sum bid that can be removed if Washington Gas agrees to move the line. The water main move will be the responsibility of the contractor. The design details are included in the plans we have provided.

Q-8 How much funding needs to be spent this fiscal year (September 30, 2013)?

Response:

A-8. The funding needed to be spent in FY 2013 is \$11,000, however the EPA is very interested in us spending down our grant funds. Please take this into consideration when laying out construction mobilization and completion timelines.

Q-9 Can you please clarify the requirement for DBE's? What level are contractors required to meet?

Response:

A-9. The requirement for DBE's is 50% participation.

Q-10 The project is scheduled for 120 days. Is this number hard and fast? If the project takes longer than the negotiated timeframe will there be liquidated damages?

Response:

A-10. We are looking for the work to be performed quickly, however we do not want to sacrifice quality for speed. If the contractor believes that the project will require more time, they should lay propose a longer construction schedule for the project. There will not be liquidated damages with this project.

Q-11 Is it the intention for the project to only perform the installation of Recharge facilities #1 and #2 only and # 3 being at a later date?

Response:

A-11. That is correct. The contractors should only bid to construct recharge facilities 1 and 2. Recharge facility 3 will be built at a later date.

Q-12 Are there any peak flow studies for the current conditions within the site, regarding water flow?

Response:

A-12. We requested this information from the designer. They have provided us with a study report which is included as an attachment to this addendum.

Q-13 The specifications for the constructed riffles in the mainstem of the stream indicate that the boulders should be 'similar color, texture, and density to the native rock in the watershed'. Can you specify which types of stone will be approved?

Response:

A-13. The designer is willing to visit potential suppliers once the contractor is chosen to approve the boulders. Native rock color in the area is predominantly a gray blue color. Many examples of this rock can be found just downstream of the project site were Broad Branch exits from the stormdrain system. The dry unit weight of the boulders shall be 160 bl/cu ft or greater. There is also a good deal of quartz boulders on-site and these may be used when excavated during the construction process rather than disposed of.

Q-14 The excavation sections of the specifications state that the on-site soils are unsuitable and the stream channel will have to be over-excavated – please define or provide some way to quantify how much over-excavation will be required, and which areas this over-excavation and replacement of materials will occur. Will over-excavation also be necessary in the tributaries?

Response:

A-14. Over-excavation below the finished grade is required for the main stem stream and wetland to both place the boulders, cobble and gravel as well as to place a 0.5' layer of compacted silt-clay layer as specified. This will average about 1' below the finished grade along the stream bed section. Some over-excavation will be needed on the tributaries in order to place the sand seepage bed below the finished grade, however much of these are severely eroded and is more fill. The plans detail the extent and amount of cut and fill on the project.

Q-15 What is the load limits on the roads for the project area?

Response:

A-15. Although we do not know the load limits, DDOT has reviewed the plans and did not make any comments about the weight of vehicles accessing the area. We would suggest that lighter vehicles should be used on the Peruvian Ambassador's residence to avoid impacts to their driveway and the historic cobble gutters adjacent to them.

Q-16 Will we be able to use existing downed plant material or trees removed as a part of construction in the project?

Response:

A-16. Yes. There is downed material in the Limit of Disturbance that can be used in lieu of bringing new woody material onto the site. Additionally the Peruvian Ambassador's residence has stated that any downed material on their property can be used. Of course the material must be in proper condition for use and approved by the construction manager.

Q-17 Will you accept an addendum to the proposal that includes add alternates, additional relevant projects, and/or additional firm information/qualifications? Or will inclusion of an addendum disqualify the entire proposal package?

Response:

A-17. Contractors should bid on the project as is so that the reviewers can compare like bids. That being said the contractor could supply an addendum to the proposal including additional relevant projects, firm information, qualifications, and ideas on how the design could be altered if they a) do not add cost to construction (and preferably reduce cost). These changes would be considered during the construction phase of the project and would need the approval of the designer, the

construction oversight contractor, DDOE, and the landholder. An addendum will not disqualify the entire proposal package.